

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the Examiner's allowance of claims 12-16, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2- 9 and 11. Claim 12 has been amended for idiomatic reasons, without a narrowing of the subject matter recited therein..

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,456,249 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson").

The Examiner cites Johnson Figs. 17-19, and column 10, lines 14-36, and contends that capacitive tuning element 164 is a single matching element. The Examiner also contends that the shunt fed resonator 17 is a monopole base element. (Detailed Action, item 3, page 2.)

Applicants submit that the portion of Johnson relied on by the Examiner discloses an antenna having three elements and two operating bands. The upper band is implemented by the shunt fed resonator 17, "with a ground connection at location 166 and a connection to the center conductor 168 of the coax signal line 170 at feed point 12." (Johnson, column 10, lines 46-48.) Thus, as is readily understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art, resonator 17 is a Planar Inverted-F Antenna (PIFA), and not "a monopole-type base element," as recited in claims 1 and 10. In particular, it is known in the art that a PIFA antenna requires positioning over a ground plane at a

predetermined spacing in order to resonate. The Specification, at page 3, lines 31-35 discloses advantages of the present invention over a PIFA antenna.

Further, the capacitive tuning element 164, which “may be a chip capacitor, an air dielectric parallel plate capacitor, or other suitable capacitive tuning devices or networks” (Johnson, column 10, lines 25-27), is not a single matching element, as contended by the Examiner. It is known in the art that a tuning element does not perform the same function as a matching element. Adjustment to a tuning element results in a shifting of the operational band, while adjusting a matching element results in a change in the reflection coefficient (which can widen the band, but not shift it). Thus, Johnson does not disclose a matching element.

Amended independent claims 1 and 10 recite “a single inductive matching element.” Support for this amendment can be found in the Specification at page 3, lines 19-26. In contrast, to a “single inductive matching element,” Johnson discloses a capacitive tuning element.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that Johnson does not disclose, nor suggest, each and every element of the invention of independent claims 1 and 10. Thus, Johnson does not anticipate claims 1 and 10. Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated October 21, 2005 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: January 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Richard J. Katz

Registration No.: 47,698  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 5257  
New York, New York 10150-5257  
(212) 527-7700  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant